

Approved For Release 2004/02/03 : CIA-RDP61-00357R000300030067-0

James C. Allen, and sundry other candidates, for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service; and George Moore, and sundry other candidates, for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

THE REGULAR ARMY, THE MARINE CORPS, THE NAVY, AND THE NAVAL RESERVE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The new reports on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read 2,702 nominations for the Regular Army, the Marine Corps, and the Navy and Naval Reserve, which had been placed on the Vice President's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, these nominations, almost 3,000 in number, have been confirmed en bloc. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin be printed in the Record. This joint resolution makes eminent good sense. The joint resolution requests the Postmaster General to issue commemorative stamps to promote traffic safety and combat the tragic loss of life on our highways. In view of the enormous attention throughout the Nation that can be won by stamps, this suggestion could very well save lives by inculcating a greater awareness of the life and death importance of safe driving on our highways. I ask that the joint resolution be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and, under the rule, was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION 42 S

Joint resolution relating to the issuance of a series of commemorative stamps on the theme of traffic safety

Whereas the commemorative postage stamp has been used effectively as a device to focus the attention of the American people on great problems in our Nation; and

Whereas the tragic loss of life and property resulting from traffic accidents is one of the great problems facing the American people, and

Whereas the State Medical Society of Wisconsin has proposed that the Post Office Department issue a series of annual commemorative postage stamps during the next 5 years in an effort to stimulate in the motorists an awareness of the need for improved driving habits by the American people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin endorse this proposal of the State Medical Society of Wisconsin; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be submitted to the Honorable A. E. Summerfield, Postmaster General of the United States, and to the members of the Wisconsin delegation in Congress.

President of the Senate.
LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
GEORGE MOLINARO,
Speaker of the Assembly.
NORMAN C. CLENNENAN,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2161. A bill for the relief of Gerald Waytashek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 2162. A bill to provide a health benefits program for Government employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. (See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. McClellan):

S. 2163. A bill for the relief of Royce C. Plume, a member of the Arapahoe Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUSKIE:

S. 2164. A bill for the relief of Osvaldo Riva Coolidge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 2165. A bill for the relief of Erica Barth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 2166. A bill referring to the U.S. Court of Claims certain matters relative to the War Production Board Limitation, Order L-208; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S.J. Res. 109. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to apportion the authorized amounts of highway funds for 1961 and 1962, and the Secretary of the Treasury to issue limited interim highway trust fund revenue bonds maturing not later than June 30, 1972; to the Committee on Finance

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of South Dakota when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 48) to promote peace through the reduction of armaments, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. HUMPHREY, which appears under a separate heading.)

HEALTH BENEFITS PROGRAM FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Oregon (Mr. NEUBERGER), I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to provide employees in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Federal Government with a system of prepaid health benefits. Such a program would provide Federal employees with invaluable assistance in paying for hospital and medical care for themselves and their families.

I compliment the distinguished Senator from Oregon (Mr. NEUBERGER) for his contribution to this proposed legislation. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Insurance of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Senator from Oregon conducted public hearings during the month of April on 6 different days on Senate bill 94, the bill introduced on January 9, because of the Senator's very recent personal experiences, I feel he brought an awareness of the importance of this subject matter to the individual employees which contributed materially to the design of this bill. In the course of the hearings, 54 witnesses were heard. The witnesses included spokesmen for the Bureau of the Budget, the Civil Service Commission, the Department of Defense, and the Post Office Department. Interest of employees in the legislation was demonstrated by the large number of employee organizations which asked to be heard and to have statements included in the Record.

As sponsor of S. 94, I have reviewed the record of the hearings. I came to the conclusion that it would be preferable to introduce a new bill rather than to have the subcommittee undertake the many revisions that were required to prepare a bill acceptable to all.

I believe the bill being introduced today resolves most, if not all, of the differences of opinion and approach which have delayed congressional consideration of this important legislation in the past. The bill provides for a reasonable degree of employee choice among different kinds of health benefits plans. It permits this choice without creating an administrative burden on payroll offices. It provides for a program of health insurance benefits which would automatically class the Federal Government as an enlightened employer, interested in the health and well-being of its employees and their families. The testimony during the hearings made it plain that up to now the Federal Government has lagged far behind private industry in this respect.

An analysis of the bill has been prepared which fully explains the provisions of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the analysis be printed in the Record at the end of my remarks. It is my hope that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will give the proposed legislation its immediate attention so that it will be ready for consideration by the Senate in the near future.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2162) to provide a health benefits program for Government employees, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The analysis presented by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF HEALTH BENEFITS PROGRAM FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Background: In one form or another, prepaid health benefits now cover 123 million persons in the United States. This is an indication of the value placed on the opportunity to budget medical care expenses by the American people. More than 75 percent of those enrolled in prepaid plans are enrolled through the place they work, clear evidence of the recognition by private employers that participating with their employees in obtaining health insurance contributes to the well-being and efficiency of their workers. In passing this legislation, the Congress would be giving Federal employees a fringe benefit second in importance to a pay raise.

As the Nation's largest single employer, the Federal Government has for many years lagged behind private industry in not making it possible for employees to band together and purchase health insurance at group rates.

In the absence of authorization for payroll deductions and the employer contribution common in industry, Federal employees have on their own initiative developed quasi-groups of various kinds. Employees have made arrangements with Blue Cross and Blue Shield or have formed their own benefit and insurance organizations, or as union members purchased group policies. Despite the resultant complications, the Committee has sought to build upon and strengthen these worthy efforts on the part of employees to protect themselves from disastrous medical bills.

Legislative history: Starting in 1947, there have been at least 30 bills introduced in the House and Senate to establish a program for Federal employees providing for (1) payroll deductions for premiums, (2) Federal contribution, (3) latitude to select a health benefits plan that fits the employees' health needs and pocketbook.

The present administration has sponsored several types of proposals in the past three Congresses. All of them called for a Federal contribution. Extensive hearings were held in May and June of 1956 by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. To date no bill has come out of committee in either the House or Senate, largely because there were disagreements about details between and among employee groups, the carriers and the proponents of the bills.

Hearings on S. 94: The Subcommittee on Health Insurance of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee held 6 days of hearings on S. 94. Fifty-four witnesses were heard. In addition, numerous organizations submitted statements and exhibits. The report on the hearings covers 364 pages. This extensive record shows clearly five significant points: (1) all parties earnestly want to see legislation enacted and are determined that past differences of viewpoint will be resolved; (2) there is a marked preference for a program with broad benefits, to the extent possible on a full-service, no-deductible basis; (3) employees should have free choice among several alternative methods of providing health benefits; (4) the contribution by the Government should be at least 50 percent; (5) future annuitants should be included in the program.

THE NEW BILL

After hearing testimony from the Civil Service Commission, the Bureau of the

Budget, the Department of Defense, and the Post Office Department, and from 24 employee organizations, and from 7 representatives of carriers and plans, and from interested organizations and citizens, a new bill has been developed which attempts to resolve the differences in viewpoint and to meet criteria that would make the program generally acceptable to all, as follows:

Effective date: The bill would provide health insurance benefits starting July 1, 1960.

Free choice among plans: For most employees there would be a choice among two or possibly three alternative plans—

1. A Blue Cross-Blue Shield and supplemental benefits package with basic benefits on a service basis, a deductible and a fixed ceiling on the amounts of coinsurance paid by the employee.

2. An insurance company package similar to No. 1, but providing cash indemnity benefits.

3. An insurance company policy providing for a deductible and coinsurance and applying to a wide range of services.

Whether both No. 2 and No. 3 would be offered employees will depend on the judgment of the administering agency and the carriers as to the feasibility of offering both. In any event, either No. 2 or No. 3 would be offered.

Employees eligible to join or already members of national employee organizations sponsoring, contracting for and administering a health benefits plan may select their organization's existing plan as amended to take advantage of the additional resources provided by the bill.

An employee living in an area where a prepaid group practice plan is established may elect such a plan. These plans are currently located in Washington, D.C., New York City, San Diego, Los Angeles, and the bay area in California, and in Seattle and Tacoma, Wash. One will be in operation in Detroit before fiscal 1961.

BROAD FRAMEWORK OF BILL

The bill provides a framework within which the Civil Service Commission can develop specific contracts for benefits. For example, it provides for programs of basic benefits coupled with supplemental benefits (major medical expense) and permits insurance company benefits (of the type referred to as comprehensive), which impose an initial deductible paid by the patient and then invoke coinsurance on the remainder. While no maximum amounts of benefits are specified in the bill, the Civil Service Commission would have authority to establish such maximums. The committee considers it unwise to tie the Civil Service Commission's hands by specifying dollar maximums or to spell out in detail the specific benefit structures. Further limitations might prove to be unnecessary and undesirable, or some kinds of benefits might, in time, become inordinately expensive in relation to the service received by employees. Furthermore, we recognize that this country may be on the threshold of several major breakthroughs in the field of medicine and in the organization of medical services; we felt it would be unwise for the legislation to freeze the pattern of benefits so that future contracts would be prevented from including new developments. For example, some new diagnostic test for cancer or heart disease might require some prompt revision of the benefit pattern.

BENEFITS

Under the bill, eligible employees and future annuitants could elect one of three generally available types of benefits:

1. Those providing for the hospital and medical costs associated with care in acute general hospitals plus 80 percent of other health service costs above \$100 per individual per illness;

2. Those providing for a large percentage of all stated health service costs above an initial deductible amount; and

3. The professional, health center and hospital services offered by group practice prepayment plans.

The details of benefits available to employees under each type of plan, as contracted for by the administering agency, are subject to prior review by the Post Office and Civil Service Committees of both Houses of the Congress and must be described in full to employees to enable them to make an informed choice among plans.

ELIGIBLE PERSONS

Employees in the executive, judicial, or legislative branches of the Federal Government would be eligible to enroll for themselves and members of their families, including children to age 19. Certain short-term appointees, seasonal or intermittent workers and the like may be excluded by regulation.

Annuitants who have been enrolled in a health benefits plan under the act and who, after the effective date, retire on an immediate annuity after 12 or more years of service, (or retire for disability) may continue under the plan together with those members of their family covered before they retired.

Survivors of eligible retired employees and of employees who may die in service, after completing 5 or more years of service, would be included.

Employees receiving Federal employee compensation, members of their families and their survivors would be eligible under similar conditions.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

The bill creates an advisory council composed of the chairman of the Senate and House Post Office and Civil Service Committees, four other public officials and five members appointed by the President, including a representative of employee organizations.

CONTRIBUTIONS AND COSTS

A health benefits fund is created for handling the moneys collected from employees and contributed by Government.

The bill specifies maximum contributions to be withheld from employees' salaries and annuitants' annuity checks. It is anticipated that actual contributions may be less than the amounts shown when contracts are negotiated with the carriers.

	Maximum biweekly contribution	
	Employee or annuitant	Government
Individual employee.....	\$1.75	\$1.75
Male employee and family (children covered to age 19).....	4.25	4.25
Female employee, dependent husband and children (to age 19).....	4.25	4.25
Female employee, nondependent husband and children (to age 19).....	6.00	2.50

When both husband and wife are employees or annuitants, each may enroll for himself alone but if children are to be included, one spouse and only one must enroll the entire family under a family policy.

ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

The bill authorizes an appropriation to cover the costs of administering the program during the first fiscal year of its operation. Thereafter, administrative costs would be met from the specified contributions of Government and employees.

AGGREGATE COSTS

Data on the number of married women working for the Government, or the number of instances where husband and wife are both Government employees, does not exist.

June 11

Hence, the cost estimate that follow assume that (1) 2 million employees will be eligible to participate in the program; (2) 90 percent of them will do so—i.e. 1.8 million employees will elect coverage; (3) 40 percent will enroll as individuals and 60 percent as families; (4) 150,000 women and nondependent husbands will enroll their families; (5) all contracts will be at the maximum biweekly contribution shown. (This assumption results in aggregate costs somewhat above those anticipated.)

On an annual basis, the assumed premiums are \$91 for single employees (\$45.50 from Government) and \$221 for family coverage (\$110.50 from Government).

720,000 single employees times \$91 equals.....	\$65,520,000
1,080,000 employees with families times \$221 equals.....	238,680,000
Total.....	304,200,000

Government contribution.....	145,300,000
Employee contribution.....	158,900,000

Assumes 150,000 female employees with nondependent husbands enroll and no Government contribution is made on behalf of these husbands.

If premiums proved to be even as little as 10 cents less biweekly on single employees and 25 cents less biweekly on families, the program would cost \$9 million less (\$4.5 million less for Government).

BUREAU OF RETIREMENT AND INSURANCE

The bill creates in the Civil Service Commission a Bureau of Retirement and Insurance headed by a Director responsible to the Commissioners. The Civil Service Commission is given authority to promulgate necessary regulations under the provisions of the act. The Commission is also charged with the responsibility for making continuing studies of the operation of the act in all its aspects, including the extent to which it meets the needs of employees and annuitants and for reporting its findings to the Congress.

THE ALREADY RETIRED ANNUITANTS

The committee considered carefully the problems faced by the present annuitant group in financing their health needs from their retirement incomes. After due consideration the conclusion was reached that their problem was of such a magnitude and complexity that it required separate study and separate legislation. The annuitant group would be expected to have higher utilization than active employees. Since they equal more than 15 percent of the number of active employees, their inclusion in the same program could raise the overall costs of the program by 30 or more percent. The committee intends to devote the necessary time to a study of the problem. It has every expectation of introducing a separate proposal that will, it is hoped, bring to these deserving former civil servants some of the advantages inherent in group purchase of health insurance.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am happy to join with the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina (Mr. JOHNSTON) in introducing a new bill to provide a program of prepaid health benefits for employees of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Federal service.

The Subcommittee on Insurance of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, of which I am chairman, held extensive hearings on S. 94. In opening these hearings I asked that the invited witnesses and those wishing to be heard from the executive branch direct their testimony to the objectives of the bill

and to possible ways of obtaining these objectives. I indicated our feeling that we were not wedded to the precise provisions or specific language of S. 94. I also called attention to the fact that most employees of the Federal Government are not highly paid individuals and that the needs of the vast majority of Federal employees should be kept in the forefront of our thinking in developing this legislation.

In the course of the 6 days of hearings, we heard from some 55 witnesses. The information they brought to our attention increased our understanding of the problems employees face in coping with serious illness and in the less dramatic day-to-day medical needs.

MANY WITNESSES HEARD ON BILL

The witnesses included 24 employee organizations, from representatives of the medical, dental, and other professions, from Blue Shield, Blue Cross, insurance companies, and group practice plans. We also had witnesses from the American Hospital Association, from mental health organizations, and the like. This extensive record of almost 400 pages has been carefully considered.

We heard testimony for and against deductibles and coinsurance, and soon came to realize there were at least two schools of thought in these matters. Our new bill, I believe will accommodate both approaches to financing health care. The employee will have a choice of four major types of plans: First, a service benefit plan such as offered by Blue Cross and Blue Shield; second, indemnity benefit plan such as offered by insurance companies; third, group practice prepayment plan where available such as is offered in the Washington area by Group Health Association and on the west coast by the Kaiser Foundation health plan; and, fourth, employee organization plan which is sponsored by a national employee organization. I am pleased to report that the able committee staff has spent the last 2 days with representatives of the insurance industry and it is my understanding that the industry is in general approval of this bill. The provisions of the bill are such that our employees will obtain protection against a financially crippling illness and assistance with the more routine costs of medical care.

Regretfully, we have bowed to the administration's insistence that the health insurance plan will not take effect until July 1, 1960. We had hoped that such a plan would become operative at least 3 to 4 months earlier than this, but the administration has steadfastly held for the July 1, 1960, operative date solely for budgetary reasons.

The administration, in its testimony on S. 94, argued strongly that Government employees pay two-thirds of the cost of their health coverage. S. 94 provided that the employee pay one-third and the Government two-thirds. From the beginning of the hearings, I made it clear that the administration recommendation with respect to the sharing of the cost was unsatisfactory. Our bill provides a compromise, and the costs are shared equally between the Govern-

ment and its employees. This is a more fair.

RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES MUST PROTECTED

We considered ways of including the present annuitant group in the coverage. In the interests of having legislation that was acceptable costwise, we have deferred action on a program for the already retired. The administration has opposed providing coverage for presently retired former Government employees and their dependents and survivors. It is true that the cost of covering this older age group might well be several times the cost of covering active employees. For those of you who are concerned with the health needs of annuitants, let me say I hope to surge the program particularly for them before long, within the next several weeks. One would be callous, indeed, to overlook the health needs of retired career Government employees. As chairman of the Insurance Subcommittee, I will do everything within my power to make certain that coverage is provided for them.

The bill we are introducing today has been developed through a truly cooperative effort on the part of many people all of them anxious to see this legislation become law. The bill necessarily represents many compromises between the views of the administration, health organizations, insurance companies, and employee groups. It is my earnest hope that this legislation can be promptly considered by the Congress so that further delay will not be encountered in meeting the health needs of Government employees and their dependents. Private industry has long provided health coverage plans for its employees and it is time that the Federal Government, the Nation's largest employer, provide equal benefits in this respect.

In conclusion, I wish to express gratitude to the distinguished chairman of the full committee for his cooperation and I desire further to thank the members of the committee staff for their help in developing this very difficult, technical proposal. We all know that providing medical care and health protection for some 2½ million Federal employees and their dependents is not an easy matter. It is a very complicated, technical, complex, and controversial subject.

I believe we have here the basis for excellent legislation. If this bill becomes law, I think it will provide a model for employers and employees throughout the Nation to establish mutual health protection programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at conclusion of my remarks a telegram I have just received from a spokesman of the insurance industry endorsing the provisions of our health benefits bill. It is important to emphasize that our bill previously received the support of Federal employee groups, group practice plans, Blue Cross-Blue Shield, American Hospital Association, and American Medical Association.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Insurance, Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Based on our conference with your committee staff yesterday and our understanding of the provisions in the bill which you will introduce today, the insurance business believes that under this bill it would have an opportunity to serve Government employees by offering them a modern pattern of health insurance benefits which has found wide public acceptance and which currently protects millions of employees in private industry.

We are of the opinion that the measure provides a practicable basis for the development of a program of health care benefits for Federal Government employees, their families, and dependents. Prior to final enactment, we urge careful consideration of the relationship of benefits and costs under the proposed legislation, because although almost all types of health care are indicated in the bill, the benefits received will necessarily depend upon the actual number of dollars available.

We hope that prompt action will be taken on the bill and stand ready to provide such further technical assistance as may be desired.

AMERICAN LIFE CONVENTION.
HEALTH INSURANCE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA.
LIFE INSURANCE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA.

APPORTIONMENT OF AUTHORIZED AMOUNTS OF HIGHWAY FUNDS FOR 1961 AND 1962 AND ISSUANCE OF LIMITED INTERIM HIGHWAY TRUST FUND REVENUE BONDS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to issue limited interim revenue bonds to keep the huge Interstate Highway program on schedule.

Grants already made to States for the fiscal years 1959 and 1960 have depleted the highway trust fund, which is formed by highway-user taxes to finance road construction.

This leaves the Secretary of Commerce unable to make State apportionments for 1961 and 1962 unless a new source of funds is found.

Under the joint resolution I am introducing, the Treasury could issue against the highway fund short-term notes totaling not more than \$5 billion up to 1972. No more than \$2 billion could be borrowed before July 1, 1961, when a special report on the Interstate Highway program cost and progress is due.

The interest on the notes or bonds issued, as well as the notes and bonds themselves, would be repaid from trust fund earnings by 1972, when present highway levies expire.

A pay-as-you-go clause now in Federal law was suspended for the years 1959 and 1960. The House Public Works Committee has recommended that it be suspended again for the fiscal year 1961. But that would throw onto the General Treasury the burden of meeting the contractor bills and would add from \$2 billion to \$3 billion to Treasury deficits.

Mr. President, that solution, I am afraid, would not receive general acceptance.

The administration has recommended a 1½-cent increase in the Federal gaso-

line tax. Thus far there has been little congressional support for it.

So I am introducing this joint resolution for interim financing in an effort to find a solution which would secure the necessary acceptance.

Mr. President, I do not know that other Senators will wish to join me at this time in sponsoring the joint resolution. However, one or two Senators have indicated some interest in this measure. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution lie at the desk until the conclusion of the session on Tuesday of next week in order that other Senators who may wish to join me in sponsoring the joint resolution may have an opportunity to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will lie at the desk, as requested by the Senator from South Dakota.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 109) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to apportion the authorized amounts of highway funds for 1961 and 1962 and the Secretary of the Treasury to issue limited interim highway trust fund revenue bonds maturing not later than June 30, 1972, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO THE ADMISSION OF THE STATE OF ALASKA INTO THE UNION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives which will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7120) entitled "An act to amend certain laws of the United States in light of the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, and for other purposes," and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In section 23(a) of the Senate amendment, strike out the word "authorizing" and insert in lieu thereof the word "directing."

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the amendment merely changes the word "authorizing" to "directing" in the proposal of the Administrative Office of U.S. Courts and the Judicial Conference with respect to the desirability of having the U.S. circuit court sit, at Anchorage, Alaska. That is the only amendment. I move that the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska state whether this is an amendment to the Alaska omnibus bill?

Mr. GRUENING. It is.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The bill amends various laws in order to facilitate the transition of Alaska from the jurisdiction of Federal laws to the jurisdiction of State laws, does it not?

Mr. GRUENING. That is correct. The bill received the unanimous approval of this body and the other body.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I commend the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and his colleague [Mr. BARTLETT] for the manner in which they have handled the proposed legislation. I am delighted to know that the bill will be on its way to the White House in a short time.

Mr. GRUENING. My colleague and I are grateful to the Senate and to the other body for their speedy action on the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

CONSOLIDATED FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1959— EXTENSION OF TIME TO HOLD BILL FOR ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, my colleague, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], on June 9, 1959, introduced the bill (S. 2144) to simplify, consolidate, and improve the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to loans to farmers and ranchers, and for other purposes, which he asked to have lie on the desk until the close of business tonight, to make it possible for other Senators to add their signatures as cosponsors. At the request of the Senator from Colorado, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be permitted to lie on the desk until Monday night for that same purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

Tribute to Roy Bedichek, of Falls County, Tex., published in the New York Herald Tribune of June 12, 1959.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address Orville L. Freeman, Governor of Minnesota, delivered at Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner, at Newark, N.J., on May 9, 1959, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

Address entitled "Cars, Cows, and Highways," delivered by Ellis L. Armstrong, Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads, at the 68th annual convention of the South Dakota Stockgrowers Association, at Rapid City, S. Dak., on June 4, 1959.

By Mr. MURRAY:

Address delivered by Mr. Clay L. Cochran, of the Industrial union department of the AFL-CIO, at the National Farmers Union convention, in Springfield, Ill.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Address on the functioning of the courts, delivered by Ross L. Malone, president of the American Bar Association, at the annual meeting of the Kansas State Bar Association at Hutchinson, Kans., on May 8, 1959.

By Mr. KEATING:

Address by Samuel F. Pryor, vice president Pan American World Airways, delivered before graduating class of St. Bonaventure University, New York, June 7, 1959.

By Mr. LAUSCHIE:

Letter addressed by him to Attorney General William P. Rogers regarding the Parker lynching case in Mississippi.